

fortius, and who has deservedly been lauded as the first consistent Protestant advocate of toleration. His book, "*De Haereticis an sint Persequendi*," professedly printed at Magdeburg in 1554, under the assumed editorship of Martinus Bellius, whose identity is uncertain, was really issued from Basel, where the tolerant spirit of Erasmus continued to leaven the University. It contains citations from the writings of some of the Protestant theologians, Luther, and even Calvin, included, Erasmus and the Church Fathers, in favour of toleration. "I have long been seeking to discover what a heretic is," wrote Castellio in his prefatory letter, "and here is what I have found : he is a man that thinks otherwise than we do respecting religion." Castellio had, of course, from the modern point of view, the best of the argument, and Beza's reply, "*De Haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis Libellus*," published in the same year, is weak both as an attack on toleration, and an apology for persecution. To cite Moses and the Jewish kings, to argue that the authority of the Bible must be vindicated by force, to quote Luther and Calvin in support of this obscurantist doctrine, was in reality to give away the Protestant principle, and write himself down a disciple of a Hildebrand and a Dominic. In this respect the reforming divines were children of mediaeval darkness.

Calvinism, as represented by Calvin himself, is not particularly concerned with the assertion or the maintenance of political liberty. It was by no means a democratic system, though it came to have democratic tendencies in the struggle of conscience against oppression. In the treatise on Civil Government contained in "*The Institute of the Christian Religion*," as finally amplified, Calvin is as dogmatic as Luther in insisting, on scriptural grounds, on submission to established authority, however unjust, and has no faith, no interest, in the political progress, the social emancipation of the masses. He rather distrusts the masses, and, like Luther, regards the salvation of men's souls as the main thing. Nay, he even holds "that spiritual liberty is perfectly compatible with civil servitude." He does not understand the assertion that "in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free" to signify the spiritual equality of Christians, apart from race or class. "It matters not what is your condition among men,